



**Bicycle/Pedestrian
Advisory
Committee
of the
Metropolitan
Planning
Organization
for the
Miami Urbanized
Area**

Chairman
Ted Silver

Members
Brett Bibeau

Sheila Boyce

Dr. Barry Burak

Louis Foster

Susan Kairalla

Amado Leon

Claudia Schmid

Eric Tullberg

Contact Information

David Henderson,
Bicycle/Pedestrian
Coordinator
davidh@miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade MPO
111 NW 1st Street, #910
Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-4507
(fax) 305-375-4950



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SOUTH MIAMI COMMISSION CHAMBERS
6130 SUNSET DRIVE
SOUTH MIAMI, FLORIDA

A G E N D A

**MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 2005
AT 7 P.M.**

- I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - MEETING OF APRIL 27, 2005
- III. PRESENTATIONS
 - A. WALK TO SCHOOL DAY – V. Villaamil, MDPS
 - B. HOMESTEAD TRANSPORTATION PLAN – F. Baron, MPO
 - C. NW 74 ST. PD&E STUDY – R. de Huelbes, FDOT
 - D. BIKE SAFETY PLAN – P. Halliburton, Cambridge Systematics
 - E. RICKENBACKER CSWY. PROJECT UPDATE – D. Henderson
- IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - A. UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI BRIDGE – D. Henderson
 - B. TIP – NON-MOTORIZED ELEMENT – D. Henderson
 - C. BRICKELL AVENUE SIDEWALK – D. Henderson
- V. INFORMATION ITEMS
 - A. M-D PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT UPDATES – J. Cohen, MDP
 - B. MPO NEWSPAPER INSERT – D. Henderson
 - C. QUARTERLY ATTENDANCE REPORT – D. Henderson
- VI. MEMBER COMMENTS

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brett Bibeau Sheila Boyce Janis Davis
Susan Kairalla Claudia Schmid Ted Silver Eric Tullberg

MEMBERS ABSENT

Barry Burak Louis Foster
Amado Leon

OTHERS PRESENT

David Henderson, Staff Jae Manzella, Staff Frank Baron, MPO Jeff Cohen, M-DPW
Lewis Sayre, FDOT Rene de Huelbes, FDOT Luis Rodriguez, FDOT John Dovel, FDOT
Vivian Villaamil, MDPS Peter Haliburton, Cambridge Systematics Jose Gonzalez, City of Miami
Tom Burton, Everglades Club Brian Hannigan, Safe Kids Coalition Sam & Karen Crispin, Cyclists
Irwin Seltzer, Cyclist Roberta Neway, Cyclist Steve Greenberg, Cyclist Noel Cleland, Cyclist

The meeting began at 7:10 p.m.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	- DH: ET has requested to present some research regarding missing linkages. ET: These projects span a couple of districts, and would benefit continuous travel.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	- SK: <i>Motion to approve Minutes of April 27, 2005; seconded by ET; vote – unanimous.</i>
WALK TO SCHOOL DAY	- VV: She is MPO School Board Representative Hantman's liaison, seeking the BPAC's endorsement for the 9 th annual international WTS Day on October 5th. MPO staff have been supportive; as well as BH, whom has been very instrumental in this cause. BB: <i>Motion supporting Miami-Dade's participation in the 2005 International Walk To School Day event; seconded by SB; vote – unanimous.</i>
HOMESTEAD TRANSPORTATION PLAN	- FB: He is the Project Mgr. A steering committee was formed, which includes business owners on Krome Av. and City of Homestead staff. Although data collection and analysis was done without bias, business owners and the City want to preserve on-street parking in the downtown area. Thus, points were tweaked to produce a certain outcome. With the alternative that was selected, bicyclists receive less than they deserve. Truck traffic was also compromised at the City's request. ET: Inquired why the proposed bikeway for Alternative A diverts cyclists onto 6 St., instead of continuing south on 4 Av. FB: That route would cross into Pioneer Village, which the City wants to preserve. It is important to focus on the #1 Alternative (E). TS: Inquired if there would be more chances to comment on this study. DH: This is the City's plan, but the FDOT has the ultimate decision for Krome Av. TS: It's difficult to make rational debate in such a short time-frame. It's unfortunate there isn't a bicycle or pedestrian representative on the steering committee. ET: There is a possibility that the Park to Park Trail will run along Mowry Canal. It would be an important connection. TS: The chart for Alt. E depicts sufficient ROW; inquired if this would continue bike lanes as the route leaves Krome Av. FB: Unable to recall if it includes enough ROW for such facilities. The City may balk at purchasing more ROW if bike lanes require it. Bicycling was the last item on their goals list; trucks were #1; then, more parking; pedestrian mobility was #10. It is too early to determine what bicyclists will be provided, since this is an overall transportation study,

	<p>wherein bicycling was only one part. The truck route has not been finalized either.</p> <p>JC: <i>Requested notification when the City determines these outcomes, so that he can review the routes for proper specifications.</i></p> <p>TS: <i>Requested a City representative to discuss this with the BPAC before it is finalized.</i></p>
NW 74 ST PD & E STUDY	<p>- RH: This is a connection between the H.E.F.T. and the Palmetto Expwy., including Palmetto Metrorail Station. Two alternatives are being determined for a western portion.</p> <p>LR: This is a 4-mile improvement. Since there is already development in the western section, ROW is constrained. In other areas, the land is fairly undeveloped, which includes a resource recovery facility. Some of the corridor between NW 87-97 Aves. has already been constructed with 4 lanes and a scramble lane. <i>For the remainder, 6 lanes will be constructed (due mostly because of traffic volumes), including bike lanes.</i> The 87-97 Aves. portion does not have bike lanes, because of constrained ROW and a high amount of truck traffic. <i>It will, however, connect to a bikeway being constructed along NW 87 Av. (from 74 to 90 Sts.)</i> Between the H.E.F.T. and NW 107 Av. ROW constraints will not allow bike lanes. Motor vehicle lanes will be reduced from 12' to 11'; medians from 22' to 14', the border width from 14' to 8'; and turn lanes from 14' to 12.5'. <i>Bike lanes will be provided between NW 107 to 87 Aves.</i></p> <p>ET: <i>If bike lanes can't be constructed, wider sidewalks should be provided.</i> Buses travel along this corridor; benches and utility poles will block a small sidewalk.</p> <p>TS: Inquired if a (minimum) 2' section is possible between the curb and travel lane. Too often engineers consider the only option to be bike lanes; there are other ways to provide cycling accommodations. When a bike lane ends, cyclists usually continue straight. Where possible, if a minimum 2' section is striped between the curb and travel lane, it provides a safer haven than sharing a lane. Motorists will more likely steer clear of cyclists if lines exist. Obviously, a bike lane is preferred; but, if it's not possible, some exclusive space is better than sharing a lane. Additionally, a sidewalk with utility poles and other street furniture is not an ideal facility for a cyclist after a bike lane ends. Not only are most sidewalk ramps inappropriate for entry speed; but staying on the road is preferred. The legal definition of a bike lane is 4'-5' wide; however, paved shoulders, wider lanes and wide sidewalks are also bicycle facilities.</p> <p>RH: Reductions have been made to fit everything in. Providing this 2' section would reduce the lane to 9', which isn't allowed.</p> <p>SB: Inquired about the 2' for curb & gutter.</p> <p>LR: Part of that 2' includes the curbing at the edge of the sidewalk; so, it's only 18".</p> <p>RH: All designs go before a design review committee. Variances will be required already. <i>He will relay the BPAC's concern;</i> but, they are bound to FDOT guidelines.</p> <p>JC: Inquired if 11' lanes are being proposed in the constrained section.</p> <p>RH: Those lanes will be 11' & 12'.</p> <p>JC: <i>When bicycle lanes end, there should be bicycle warning and "Share the Road" signs.</i> This is an MUTCD option. He offered to review the plans with RH at a later date.</p> <p>CS: In Europe, white dashed lines are used to indicate where bicyclists may ride, even though this area can be used by motorists when a cyclist is not present.</p> <p>TS: This is not allowed in the US.</p> <p>BB: <i>Medians should be reduced, adding that space to the outside lane.</i></p> <p>LR: The FDOT standard is 22', which is allowed to be reduced to 19'; otherwise a variance is required. The medians become turn lanes.</p> <p>BB: Miami-Dade County has one of the worst records for bicycle safety within the</p>

	<p>nation. It seems that the FDOT criteria needs to be revised in order to save lives.</p> <p>TS: The word “variance” has been used repeatedly today. Since this committee cannot argue against the criteria today, <i>a recommendation is being made to include more space in the road for bicycling at sections where bike lanes are not being provided.</i></p> <p>LR: There are physical restraints that have been compromised, for example the medians.</p> <p>BB: Now that the FDOT engineer knows that even 2’ can better accommodate cyclists, rather than eliminating all possibilities because a 16’ bike path can’t be included, <i>these sections warrant another review for bicycle accommodations.</i></p> <p>TS: If the pavement is poured correctly, the curb edge would be flush with the roadway.</p> <p>JC: <i>The Miracle Mile median treatment should be considered.</i> The medians proposed for NW 74 St. are more dangerous than double-yellow lines. Drivers will hit the curbing.</p> <p>RH: Miracle Mile is a reduced-speed area. This corridor is designed for 45 mph.</p> <p>JM: Perhaps the need for 6-lanes in that section is not crucial.</p> <p>DH: Extensive truck traffic warrants more need for bicycle accommodations, rather than eliminating any. Connecting the end-of-the-line Metrorail Station is a highly sought goal.</p> <p>JC: Leaving out a bikeway because it doesn’t tie into another is self-serving. The FDOT just redesigned the portion to the east of this project without a bikeway. FDOT District IV builds bike lanes for every project, no matter how long it is. They buy the ROW necessary to accomplish this. The entire parcel is not required; just a 4’ strip.</p> <p>ET: <i>Drainage grates have to be bicycle-friendly</i>; steep slopes or long slots are not.</p> <p>BB: <i>Motion requesting the FDOT to review the designs for the NW 74 St. project to incorporate a minimum 2’ wide space between the curbing and the outside lanes, as well as install bicycle warning and “Share the Road” signage in those sections where bike lanes cannot be provided; seconded by SB; vote unanimous.</i></p>
BICYCLE SAFETY STUDY	<p>- PH: Six years of bicycle crash data was reviewed to identify high crash locations and determine probable causes. Review of ages indicate a peak around the late teens, as well as late 40’s-early 50’s. The 5-6 o’clock hours indicate another peak in occurrences. High-density clusters have been mapped. Fatality and incapacitating crashes occur more often in the morning, and most crashes occur during daylight. Drug and alcohol use (by bicyclists) is a relatively small factor. No race is more heavily affected, compared to others. Severe crashes happen more often to middle-age cyclists. Where speeds tend to be higher, there are more severe crashes. <i>Four areas will be reviewed in more detail within the next couple of months: South Beach, Liberty City, Perrine and North Miami.</i> In Liberty City, the crash severities were significantly higher. Perrine had more drink/drug crashes. Educating youth and seniors is one countermeasure.</p> <p>CS: Inquired if overall use is reflected proportionally in crashes. For instance if there are more younger riders, that would help explain why there are more crashes to youth.</p> <p>PH: Unfortunately, the only data available are national averages. The next map depicts clusters of particular crash-types. This helps to identify where specific engineering techniques could be beneficial. Intersection conflicts or avoiding parked cars are examples. Wrong-way riding is a clustered group. In Miami Beach: 15/17 Sts. & Alton Rd., and 5 St. & Euclid Av. are high-crash areas where intersection designs need to be reviewed. In Key Biscayne: Harbor Dr. & Crandon Blvd. are high-crash areas.</p> <p>JC: <i>Both Harbor Dr. and Crandon Blvd. will be redesigned with bike lanes.</i></p> <p>PH: In Liberty City: NW 79 St. and 27 Av. is a dangerous intersection. People are ignoring traffic signals. In Perrine: Campbell Dr. & US-1 is dangerous, because of the speed motorists are allowed. Signal timing to allow bicycle crossing is a countermeasure.</p> <p>TS: Disappointed that signal actuators in the road do not sense bicycles. In some places,</p>

	<p>if a signal hasn't changed after several minutes, a cyclist is allowed to ignore the red light. Newer types of actuators are more sensitive, yet more bikes are being made without steel. BH: Even his motorcycle doesn't trip detectors.</p> <p>PH: <i>Hopes to finalize the study in early August, when it will go before the study advisory committee. He will then make another presentation to the BPAC.</i></p> <p>CS: Crossing US-1 is problematic, motorists turning right on the red light don't bother to stop or check if someone is crossing. She would like a traffic cop stationed at Sunset Dr.</p> <p>BB: Inquired about Miami-Dade's crash-rate status.</p> <p>DH: Florida is still most-dangerous per capita. Tampa and Hillsborough Counties are worse than Miami-Dade, as is Broward.</p>
BRICKELL AV. SIDEWALK STUDY	<p>- JG: He is the City of Miami's Assist. Trans. Coordinator. There is a proposed ordinance to prohibit bicycles, skateboards, scooters, mopeds, etc. on the eastern-sidewalk of Brickell Av. This is similar to the 2003 ordinance prohibiting such on SW 8 St., between SW 4 Av. to Tamiami Canal Rd. In March, the City requested meetings held between City & County staff, Brickell Homeowners Assns., the BPAC and the MPO in an attempt to come to an agreement without the use of an ordinance. Subsequently, a study was initiated to observe weekday and weekend conflicts. These observations lasted one Tuesday and during a Saturday morning. Results concluded that there weren't any observed conflicts. Although bicycle-use was very low, the peak time was between 8-8:45 am. (around 13-14 Sts.) The recommendation was there wasn't a need warranting change; however, the City could erect warning signs, if desired. Afterwards, conflicts between bicyclists and motorists was voiced at a subsequent Commission meeting, (which was not part of the initial scope.) He assumes the observer would have noted such in the report. The Commission then deferred the item for another 60 days to expand the scope and include more observations, as well as determine feasible alternative bike routes.</p> <p>TS: <i>It needs to be clarified that conflicts on the road should not be used by the City to ban cyclists from the path.</i></p> <p>SB: She believes there to be more potential conflicts for automobiles existing driveways than bicycles with pedestrians on the path.</p> <p>TS: Along bike paths with driveways, motorists don't tend to stop at the paths, they stop before the roadway. <i>The scope should be expanded to include conflicts between pedestrians and motorists.</i> This is a design issue.</p> <p>SG: He has lived and cycled on Brickell for at least 10 years. Conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians are rare. He normally rides between 5-7 pm. He's never seen anyone wrong-way riding on the road. Conflicts with motorists to/from driveways and pedestrians with baby carriages (or dogs) are more frequent. There are few cyclists using the path. He wouldn't mind using the western sidewalk of Brickell Av., as long as it was redesigned properly; currently, it's broken-up and narrow. Eventually, getting to the Rickenbacker Cswy. requires using the eastern path. Crossing Brickell Av. has become troublesome, due to the new ramp configurations.</p> <p>TS: Every ramp at US-1 & Brickell Av. directs users away from their intended route. <i>If the City pursues a ban on the east side, then a proper facility to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians has to be built on the west side, or else they can be sued.</i></p> <p>JG: The City Attorney has advised that any action has to be warranted.</p> <p>JC: In 1970's, the County and FDOT routed bicyclists on (a purposely widened) Brickell Av. sidewalk from Rickenbacker Cswy., north to Biscayne Blvd. as Bike Route 1. Signage has worn away. <i>Deficiencies of the facility should be reviewed.</i> Some examples</p>

	<p>would be to widen the path, as well as remove illegal encroachments by the condominiums; there have been trees planted and benches placed that block travel. A bike path, as opposed to a sidewalk, is not supposed to have these barriers; and a 2-foot clearance from barriers is supposed to be maintained. The ramps were built to sidewalk standards, as opposed to a bikeway's.</p> <p>SG: The City just replaced many ramps at the wrong width. He was assisting a wheelchair-bound person, and barriers along this route made it very difficult.</p> <p>JM: <i>The scope should identify condominiums with improper sight-designed driveways.</i></p> <p>JC: There is a mandated 10x10 sight-triangle for any driveway to a public ROW. The use of parabolic mirrors can help, but they are not an ideal alternative. <i>Warning signs should be introduced at all driveways.</i></p> <p>SG: The FDOT is performing a PD&E study for this corridor. <i>The City will present it's findings adding it for this purpose.</i></p> <p>JC: The City must not overstep its jurisdiction. The FDOT and Miami-Dade County has specific rights how to regulate traffic. The City can make recommendations.</p> <p>SG: At previous meetings, City staff indicated they want motor vehicles to move quicker along this corridor. He does not believe this is what homeowners in the area want.</p> <p>JC: An "additional" (not alternative) route would be Miami Av. Striping was redesigned which provides 4' next to the inside medians; <i>this could be moved to provide bike lanes.</i></p> <p>NC: The original complaint was regarding pathway conflicts. If the consultant is also directed to note roadway conflicts, it doesn't address the original intent of the ordinance.</p> <p>ET: This is an education issue. <i>All safety literature should include the yield-to hierarchy.</i></p> <p>BB: Inquired about JC's opinion on the proposed ordinance.</p> <p>JC: He recommends denying prohibited unfettered use of public ROW; unless it is hazardous and as long as there is a logical alternative. There seems to be a social stigma that bicycle riders are lower-income, riffraff and don't belong in this neighborhood.</p> <p>TS: <i>Requested all staff to notify him when there are more chances to provide input.</i></p>
RICKEN - BACKER CSWY UPDATE	<p>- JC: The project has been split again from the larger resurfacing project. <i>Construction may begin within 3-4 months. Funding will be sought for the Powell bridge railings on the north side. When railings are added (with as-yet unidentified funds), then the facility would be designated official bike lanes.</i> Toll rate increases may fund this project.</p> <p>TS: The source of the funding has lead to uncorroborated rumor.</p> <p>JC: <i>The 1st phase would be from Bear Cut Bridge to the marina. Right turn bays will be modified and striped to allow cyclists a straight-thru route. Existing bulb-outs will be trimmed back, and asphalt would be added where needed. The Village of Key Biscayne project will provide bike lanes on Crandon Blvd. from Harbor Dr. to the new City Hall. A future phase will provide continuation of the bike lanes to the State Park.</i></p> <p>BB: Inquired if the project timeline is set.</p> <p>JC: He could not confirm this.</p> <p>BB: These improvements are long overdue, suggested a press release and ceremony.</p>
UofM PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE	<p>- JC: He attended the 2nd meeting with the City of Coral Gables, MDT, FDOT, UofM, and MDPW staff. The City has hired a consultant to review conditions on the north and east sides of the campus. An initial recommendation was to install an impermeable fence along US-1, between the walk-way and Stanford Dr. to eliminate jay-walking along this route. Fencing may also be installed south of the walk-way to Alhambra Cr. Signage would direct pedestrians to the walk-way. A near-side signal light, which warns motorists</p>

	<p>of the up-coming stop signal has also been proposed. Constructing the M-Path's missing gap and improving the existing design could help as well. It is advised to close-off other routes, if construction of the pedestrian bridge is done. Providing direct access to the station is imperative; rather than having to go up the bridge, then down again.</p> <p>TS: <i>Requested to be kept informed of any progress.</i> The BPAC is disappointed that none of the plans for the South Miami bridge didn't have direct access to the station.</p> <p>RN: The bridge won't help her or others trying to traverse US-1 in other places than Mariposa Ct. The eastern sidewalk is narrow.</p> <p>JC: This was a deficiency identified by the consultant. He's suggested a southbound J-shape intersection at San Amaro/US-1 to ease congestion at S. Alhambra Blvd.</p> <p>JM: It's easier to be killed or maimed by an automobile traveling 45 mph than 40 mph. <i>There enough motor & pedestrian traffic in this area that the speed should be lowered.</i></p> <p>SK: Motorists are traveling faster than 45 mph in this area.</p> <p>JC: This was brought up and FDOT will not lower the speed limit. Posted speed limits do not slow down traffic. Lowering the speed invites more disparity between driver speeds.</p> <p>RN: When she contacted the City of Coral Gables on meeting dates, she felt indifference and aversion to getting information out to the public.</p>
TIP NON-MOTORIZED ELEMENT	<p>- DH: The TIP's Non-Motorized section was included in the Agenda package. The MPO will be reviewing the document next month, after the next BPAC meeting.</p> <p>TS: Requested quick comments, and <i>this issue to be deferred till next month.</i></p> <p>BB: Inquired about some projects that were not listed.</p> <p>DH: Those projects are to be funded this year, thus not listed for next year.</p> <p>BB: Inquired about the J. Marti Pk. section of Riverwalk.</p> <p>DH: <i>Will research this.</i></p> <p>CS: <i>Requested a list of acronyms.</i></p> <p>DH: <i>Will provide such.</i></p> <p>JD: Inquired if any projects are within the Miami Gardens area.</p> <p>DH: The Snake Creek Greenway extension is being developed by MDP&R. Also, the City has applied for a Safe Routes to School grant.</p> <p>JD: <i>Requested more information to discuss projects with Mayor Gibson.</i></p> <p>DH: <i>He will send JD a copy of the Citizens TIP, which is easier to read.</i></p> <p>JM: The MPO also has a website, which locates projects by addresses or intersections.</p> <p>DH: <i>Will provide the link to all BPAC members.</i></p>
MISCEL-LANEOUS	<p>- ♦ TS: <i>Preferred to defer the new item reporting missing linkages by ET for the next meeting.</i></p> <p>♦ DH: <i>Requested the group to pose for pictures to be posted on the MPO website.</i></p> <p>♦ IS: Frustrated that the new path along the Coconut Grove waterfront is blocked to the public, yet the restaurant is serving diners there.</p> <p>SB: Shares his frustration.</p> <p>DH: <i>Will review the situation and report back to the group.</i></p>

- *The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.*